## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 26-30, 32-33, 35-44, and 47-50 have been canceled. Claims 1-25, 31, 34, and 45-46 had been previously canceled. Claims 51-70 have been added. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration, reexamination, and allowance of the application in view of the present amendment and the following remarks.

Claims 26-30, 32-33, 35-39, 43, 44, 47, 48, and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Watts (USPN 4,412,294) in view of Fumoto (USPN 5,200,738). Claims 40-42 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Watts. In order to expedite allowance, the rejected claims are being cancelled herein, without disclaimer and without prejudice. According, it is respectfully submitted that these rejections are now moot.

Claims 51-70 have been added to clarify certain features of the subject matter being claimed. The limitations in these new claims are not disclosed or suggested in either Watts or Fumoto (whether alone or in combination).

The Watts reference is directed to an archaic 1980's computer system using a character generator to vertically scroll one row of characters in one of the split regions **up (or down)**. See Figs. 1a and 6. Watts discloses using a right attribute (RA) and a left attribute (LA). See FIG. 7 and Col. 8, lines 1-17. Specifically, to scroll one row of characters in a right split (or partition) region **up (or down)**, Watts discloses using its RA to point from the first successive row to a next successive row (i.e., from **the first character** of the first

successive row to **the first character** of the next successive row) "by the **linking** of one or more **row** attribute bytes or 'pointers' **to** each character and character attribute **row** stored in the display memory." See Col. 8, lines 1-17 and Col. 1, lines 47-50. As such, Watts in detail is directed to nothing more than a **whole row** pointer (e.g., RA or LA) for performing a **vertical** scrolling operation within a particular split region using the RA and/or LA (e.g., scrolling in a right split region using the RA and scrolling in a left split region using the LA).

The Fumoto disclosure is only provided for its *conclusory* comment that "the operation for scrolling in the horizontal (X) display direction ... is basically identical to that described above...." As is shown in Fig. 4 of Fumoto, however, there is no teaching or suggesting in Fumoto (or Watts) on how "the operation for scrolling in the horizontal (X) display direction [of Fumoto]... is basically identical" to or **can even be** adapted with the vertical scrolling method of Watts.

In addition, Watts and Fumoto do not disclose or suggest how the **row by row** (or address by address) **vertical** scrolling method in Watts can even be adapted with Fumoto to teach any **pixel by pixel** scrolling method. As such, Watts and Fumoto certainly cannot disclose, suggest, or teach the **pixel by pixel horizontal** scrolling method of the present invention, i.e., a pixel by pixel method for horizontally scrolling **a display window based on a received numerical value** as defined by the present new claims.

The support for the new claims can be found in the disclosure on at least pages 59-63 (e.g., 60-61), FIGs. 15-16, and original Claims 1-18.

In view of the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully submit that claims 51-70 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested, and a timely Notice of Allowability is solicited. If there are any remaining issues that can be addressed over the telephone, the Examiner is encouraged to call Applicants' attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By 
Peter C. Hsueh
Reg. No. 45,574
626/795-9900

PCH/rf
MEE PAS645847.1-*-10/3/05 2:53 PM